

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Final Office Action mailed 4/5/05, Applicant is filing this amendment. Please amend claims 23 and 29. Accordingly, claims 23-33 are still pending.

In the Office Action mailed 4/5/05, the Examiner has rejected claims 23-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh et al. (Pub. No. US2002/0147875; "Singh"). Applicant has amended independent claims 23 and 29 to better recite the drive for an arbitration and evaluation of the request occurring in one clock cycle to allow an agent to request and win arbitration in one clock cycle. The Examiner has noted text at paragraphs [0028-0029], [0044], [0063-0064] and [0068] of Singh as disclosing the recited elements of claims 23 and 29 of the present application. However, no such wording is evident in the noted paragraphs. Applicant requests the Examiner to highlight the exact text, if such teachings are disclosed.

Applicant submits that text at paragraph [0059], in reference to Figure 3a of Singh, states the contrary. For example, "FIG. 3a is a timing diagram illustrating example bus transaction phase relationships for two example transactions..." and in which "... for transaction 1, arbitration occurs in bus clock cycles 1 and 2, request occurs in cycles 3 and 4, snoop occurs in cycles 6 and 7 and response and data transfer occur in cycles 13 and 14." Thus, two cycles are involved, not just one. Furthermore, the text at paragraph [0070] of Singh states that for signal A#, "...A# is asserted at the beginning of cycle 1, it is not observed on the bus until the beginning of cycle 2." Accordingly, Applicant does not read any teachings in Singh to provide for an arbitration request and evaluation occurring in one clock cycle.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) may be improper. The present application is a continuation application and has priority to parent application 09/680,523 (now U.S. Patent 6,678,767), which has a filing date of 10/06/2000. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner may have erroneously cited Singh as prior art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allow pending claims 23-33, as amended. In responding to the current office action, Applicant is submitting a petition and fee for a two-months extension of time to file the RCE.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON, LLP  
(Customer No. 34,399)

Date: 9-6-05

By: William W. Kidd  
William W. Kidd  
Reg. No. 31,772  
Phone: (512) 263-1842  
Fax No: (512) 263-1469  
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com